



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,706	09/29/2003	Hye-Sook Hwang	0630-1851P	9257

2292 7590 07/16/2008  
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

ALI, FARHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2146

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/16/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/671,706</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> HWANG, HYE-SOOK</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> FARHAD ALI</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 2146</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 24 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Claim 17. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Jeffrey Pwu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146

/Farhad Ali/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2146

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
applicant has argued :

The Office Action acknowledges that Zintel does not disclose these features [see page 2 of the Office Action). Then, the Office Action states that the Abstract in Meyerson teaches these features of independent claims [see page 3 of the Office Action). The Office Action further states that Myerson teaches a method that enables a CP to automatically establish communications with these secondary devices through the use of advanced searching methods, and an ability to choose which devices and information are displayed to the user. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Meyerson teaches that "the central processing unit automatically establishes communication with the secondary devices through the transceiver by sequentially [or in parallel] attempting communication with the secondary devices using a plurality of known communication protocols until communications are established, and the central processing unit changes the user interface depending upon which secondary devices are in communication with the primary device." Hence, in Meyerson, if the central processing unit's attempt to communicate with the secondary devices is successful, the central processing unit will automatically communicate with the secondary devices. Therefore, the central processing unit in Meyerson does not selectively communicate with the secondary devices based on the result of comparing a read identifier and a preset identifier. Furthermore, the central processing unit in Meyerson does not have an ability to choose which devices and information are displayed to the user. Rather, Meyerson does not teach that the central processing unit itself is not selective in communication but teaches that the communication with the secondary devices depends on successful attempts by the central processing unit. Therefore, Meyerson, even when combined with Zintel, fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 6.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Meyerson does not specifically disclose that when the attempt to communicate with a secondary device is successful that the cpu will automatically communicate with the secondary devices. In contrast, Meyerson teaches in Column 1 Lines 61-63 that "The invention identifies the secondary devices detected based on the data the secondary devices return, possibly in combination with known data" and further in Column 2 Lines 18-34, "The invention can support user specified device detection and reconfiguration procedures (not just preprogrammed procedures that are delivered with the primary device)". Furthermore, the applicants claim a "judging unit to compare the read network transmission possible identifier with a preset network transmission identifier", which is read upon by Meyerson teaching of device detection based on the data they return (compare to known data); "to judge whether to perform network transmission of the device characteristic data as a result of the comparison" is read upon by Meyerson simply whether the device can be identified based on comparing data returned to known data; "and to selectively transmit the device characteristic data when the comparison result of the judging unit indicates the network transmission of the device characteristic data should be performed" is read upon by Meyerson simply by choosing to selectively transmit whenever device detection and identification is possible/successful. The claim language does not specify a specific type or method of comparison nor the specific method or process used to judge based upon said comparison.